



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and Social Progress in Mediæval England and Scotland. Here the author manifests that national partiality, some evidence of which was exhibited in his *Union of England and Scotland*. He resents the tendency on the part of some writers to ignore all except the Anglo-Saxon element of the population in the making of English history, but, in his criticism of the same, he appears to go to the other extreme and practically adopts Seeböhm's theory of the prevalence of the manor and the exceptional character of the free village community in the early Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. He insists upon the continuity of the influence of Roman institutions in Britain and argues for the identity of the social and, in many respects, of the political organization of the Celt and Saxon.

There are a number of typographical errors and omissions in addition to the few which were discovered and noted in a slip inserted in the first volume. Moreover, while considerable license may be permitted in the spelling of proper names consistency in usage may be demanded. This has not always been observed as, for example, "Cologne" and "Köln" appear upon the same page (Vol. I, p. 140, lines 8 and 37) and three different spellings, "Marsilius," "Marsilio" and "Marsiglio" are used for the same writer (Vol. I, p. 372; Vol. II, p. 21, and Index to Vol. II).

These defects, however, are slight when compared with the many excellent qualities of the work. A select bibliography of sources accompanies each chapter and each volume has a carefully prepared index. The work as a whole promises to be an important and valuable contribution and the remaining volumes will be awaited with much interest.

ISIDOR LOEB.

The Congress of Arts and Science, Universal Exposition, St. Louis, 1904. Edited by HOWARD J. ROGERS, A.M., LL.D., Director of Congresses. Volume II. History of Politics and Economics, History of Law, History of Religion. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company. 1906. Pp. x, 662.)

The second volume of papers read at the most notable assembly of eminent men of learning ever held in America comprises three of the six "departments" of the Division, Historical Science; the remaining departments, History of Language, History of Literature,

and History of Art, being reserved for Vol. III. Besides the abstracts of minor papers and the bibliographies, there are thirty-six papers in all, with an average of seventeen pages. Their significance is unique, for their prevailing purpose is to explain the nature, method, and most urgent problems of the respective branches of historical science as it is thus broadly defined. Each is a living message from a man on the exploring line. Each of these representative writers, teachers, and investigators of the Old World or of the New rises from his work for a moment to tell his most intimate thought regarding his own craft. What an enlightening index to the complex chart of intellectual achievement at the dawn of the twentieth century, the eight volumes of the St. Louis Congress will form! Yet it might have been a truer guide, for on the program of the Congress, women of thought are not represented in right proportion.

The opening paper for the Division by President Woodrow Wilson on the very fitting theme of The Variety and Unity of History forcefully discusses the fundamental weakness of the existing attempts at synthesis through the coöperative plan as exemplified in Traill's *Social England*, Acton's *Cambridge Modern History*, and Winsor's *Narrative and Critical History of America*. These have "no wholesome singleness, or integrity of conception." History should be a "process of interpretation;" and true synthesis must come by means of "literary art and the conceiving imagination." Yet these factors may not be inconsistent with the coöperative method, if only the specialist be trained to take the right point of view, to perceive that synthetic interpretation is the real goal of all sound historical writing. The problem of Historical Synthesis is likewise dealt with in a brilliant paper by Prof. Charles W. Colby. In his view, while the demands of criticism may be "more urgent and exacting," utilitarian "instinct at its strongest urges the historian to do something with his facts after he has got them." Yet, contrary to the orthodox opinion "prevalent in high quarters," he need not utterly suppress his own personality. "The man who thinks himself so complete a master of historical synthesis that when he opens his lips he is declaring a verity of science, would seem, however learned and gifted, to be working on a false theory." Fustel de Coulanges might indeed so deceive himself; but in fact the work even of the most careful writers—that of Ranke, Stubbs, or Gardiner, for instance—is tinged more or less by personal feeling or opinion. Indeed, as Professor Colby suggests, why should an author

"attempt to efface himself?" It is quite possible that historical truth may be "deepened by familiarity with Michelet, Quinet, Macaulay, or Green."

In his treatment of the "Conception and Method of History," Prof. James Harvey Robinson gives a most helpful and clarifying discussion of the relation between history and literature. Only in the field of history, he urges, is it a reproach to fail to be "interesting." Consequently, "in no other subject do purely literary ideals so constantly invade the scientific." By literary ideals is not meant clearness, order, propriety of diction, or even vigorous and effective presentation; but rather "stylistic expedients which belong to fiction and poetry, oratory and the drama, without which these would collapse and fall away into dust and ashes." Thus the scientific principle of the continuity or unity of history finds its antithesis in the harmful and "inveterate habit of dividing the past into periods, epochs, eras and ages." This is due mainly to the striving for vigorous presentation and dramatic effects. "Behind the craving for definite periods lies the literary sense rather than the scientific." To the same influence is due the emphasis placed upon the "exceptional and startling," rather than the more homely economic, social, or institutional facts upon which a true knowledge of the past life of man depends. It is high time that history should entirely emancipate itself from its long servitude to the literary tradition.

Prof. William Milligan Sloane illustrates the progress made in the "Science of History in the Nineteenth Century" by the methods and conceptions of four men—"perhaps not the greatest, but types at least of the best in four great lands"—Macaulay, Ranke, Taine and Bancroft. This choice is surprising, to say the least. The time is past when the methods and ideas of Macaulay or even those of Taine will be generally accepted as typical of the best scientific writing in their century; while it is simply astonishing that George Bancroft should be put at the head of this list, because to all which the other three possessed he "added another element, the profound conviction of God working in history;" for "his reading of 'philosophy working by example' was 'God working by example.'" Bancroft was indeed industrious, a lover of democracy, and he piously believed that the colonists, especially the New England colonists, were God's chosen people. But these characteristics were hardly enough to make him a scientific historian. His methods were vicious and he has done much

to hinder a right understanding of the origin of the American nation. Professor Sloane is severe on Gibbon. The man who reads this "eulogist of heathen effeminacy," this "apologist for pagan morality," "is hard pressed for time." Yet is it quite certain that Bancroft is a safer guide to the student of the rise of the United States than is Gibbon to the student of the decline and fall of Rome?

Only a passing reference can here be given to a few of the papers in this exceedingly interesting volume. The advantage of a more exhaustive study of the later Middle Ages, as compared with the earlier period, already pretty thoroughly understood, is powerfully presented by Prof. George Burton Adams. Nowhere, perhaps, has Professor Lamprecht expounded in a more convincing way his well-known theory than in his "Historical Development and Present Character of the Science of History." From the modern point of view, "history is primarily a socio-psychological science." It "plays a double part: (1) as the basis of the practical as of the theoretical mental sciences; and (2) as stimulus to an historical method within the range of psychology." Thus history, as Lamprecht conceives it, is very closely allied to sociology, resting upon the same psychological basis. The two papers in the section on the "History of America" are especially valuable. In the "Relation of American History to Other Fields of Historical Study," Prof. Edward Gaylord Bourne luminously discusses four general questions: "What should be the attitude of the student of European history to American history? What does American history contribute to the interpretation of European history? In what ways has America affected the development of European life? and, lastly, What advantages may be derived in the United States and in Europe from a more thorough investigation and more general study of the history of Spanish America?" In particular, it is insisted, contrary to the prevalent opinion that the Spanish treatment of inferior or dependent races "compares favorably as a whole with the contemporary treatment accorded to such dependents by the English colonists." Prof. Frederick Jackson Turner's "Problems in American History" shows what a unique opportunity is afforded in the new world for "understanding the processes of social development." There one may follow the whole course of institution-building from the beginning. Within the "all-embracing problem" of the "description and explanation of the progress of this society" are contained many subordinate problems. First among

them are the questions arising in the "complex of physiographic sections," over which the forming American people has spread. In a most convincing way, Professor Turner demonstrates how much our history would be enriched by an intelligent and many-sided study of "American sectionalism." Various other problems awaiting solution are pointed out; and the whole paper affords a vivid glimpse of a most fertile part of the vast unworked field which still invites the explorer.

The department, entitled "The History of Law" has a number of strong papers. Of special merit is Prof. Munroe Smith's treatment of the "Problems of Roman Legal History." The period of the Roman law extending from about the middle of the third century B.C. to the middle of the third century A.D. is believed to be the most important; and the method of further investigation which promises the best results is that of comparison. In particular, Professor Smith suggests a comparison with "Anglo-American legal development from the thirteenth century to the present day." There are fundamental analogies between the legal, constitutional, and political history of the Romans and that of the Anglo-American people which he discusses with much learning and originality. A new and hopeful outlook is thus given for future study that should yield abundant fruit. In his "Characteristics of the Common Law" Prof. Nathan Abbott reveals a keenness of vision which marks the thorough student of historical jurisprudence. The characteristics of the common law are affected by its source. "This source is either popular or professional. The former contributes simplicity, adaptability and progress—the latter technicality, rigidity, and conservatism. In America, law has become a practical science, and the problem of adjusting the ideals of the expert to the comprehension and needs of the common person is being worked out with the aid of the disposition of the American to favor common sense rather than abstract theory." Here is a pregnant suggestion. Will the problem be thus worked out fast enough to meet the exigencies of the present social crisis?

Many other papers by eminent specialists invite attention. In particular, it would be a pleasure to summarize the two hundred pages of the division relating to the "History of Religion;" but perforce, for want of space, the reviewer must be invidious. The volume is enriched by select bibliographies and by short biographies of the contributors.

GEORGE ELLIOTT HOWARD.